FILE

2018 Sap-16 PM 07:02 U.S. DISTRICT COURT N.D. OF ALABAMA

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA

EASTERN DIVISION

04 APR 16 AM 9: 4

U.S. BISTRICT COURT N.D. OF ALABAMA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, * Case No. CR-02-BE-124-E

v.

8

9

10

11

12

16

Birmingham, Alabama

TERRY LYNN FOREHAND,

* December 2, 2002

Defendant. *

TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE KARON O. BOWDRE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

13 FOR THE GOVERNMENT:

ADIOPH DEAN
Assistant United States Attorney
15 1801 4th Avenue North
Birmingham, Alabama 35203

17 FOR THE DEFENDANT:

J. SCOTT BOUDREAUX 604 38th Street, South Birmingham, Alabama 35222

20 Court Reporter:

Teresa Roberson, RPR, RMR
Federal Court Reporter
1729 North Fifth Avenue, Suite 325
Birmingham, Alabama 35203

2425

23

PROCEEDINGS

* * * * *

4

(Open court.)

6

7

8

THE COURT: The matter before the Court at this time is the case of United States of America versus Terry Lynn

Forehand, CR-02-BE-124-E.

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

Mr. Boudreaux, I assume that you and your client have had thirty-five days in which to review the presentence

report?

11

MR. BOUDREAUX: Yes, ma'am. And I forwarded it to my

client who has been incarcerated down in Montgomery County in

the Montgomery City Jail and I forwarded it to him either the

same day or the following day that I received it. And I

forwarded it to him on October 29th, so it might be right at

thirty-five days. We have had adequate amount of time.

THE COURT: All right. Do you have any objection to

the contents of the report other than those that we have

addressed in chambers and will be addressing?

MR. BOUDREAUX: No, ma'am.

21

THE COURT: After consulting with the Assistant United

22

States Attorney Adolph Dean, Jr. and defense attorney Scott

23

Boudreaux and the probation office, the Court has concluded

24

that the attempted armed bank robbery conviction listed in

25

paragraph sixty-two of the presentence report for which the

defendant pled guilty in the Middle District of Alabama on July 10, 2002 and was sentenced to ninety-six months custody to be followed by five years supervised release, on November 12th 2002, should have been treated as relevant conduct to the instant offenses of conviction and therefore should not have been assessed as criminal history points.

The attempted bank robbery should be calculated into total offense level. The guideline computations for the attempted bank robbery produces an adjusted offense level, subtotal of twenty-seven, which then receives one unit pursuant to the provisions at USSG Section 3(d)1.4. The total number of units is then three and one half and the increase in the offense level is four.

Consequently, the presentence report is amended to reflect the following: The combined adjusted offense level at paragraph fifty becomes thirty-one; the total offense level at paragraph fifty-two is twenty-eight; the total offense level at paragraph fifty-four is twenty-eight. Paragraph sixty-two receives zero criminal history points. Paragraph sixty-four is then amended to read the total of the criminal history points is nine. According to the sentencing table at USSG Chapter 5 Part A, nine criminal history points establish a criminal history category of four. Paragraph eighty-four is amended to read, "based on a total offense level of twenty-eight and a criminal history category of four, the guideline range for

imprisonment is one hundred ten to one hundred thirty-seven months in counts one, three and four." The rest of the paragraph would remain the same.

The Court also notes for the record that the charge listed as pending in paragraph sixty-seven of the presentence report was dismissed on November 26, 2000.

The Court thus adopts the other factual statements that were contained in the presentence report.

Count five requires a sentence of eighty-four months, which is a mandatory consecutive sentence required by statute. Supervised release period is from three years to five years, and the fine range is from twelve thousand five hundred to one hundred twenty-five thousand dollars.

Restitution is an issue in this case.

Mr. Boudreaux, do you have anything to say in mitigation or otherwise before the Court pronounces sentence?

MR. BOUDREAUX: Yes, ma'am. May it please the Court, Judge, although we have had extensive discussions between myself and Mr. Dean and the probation office, the Court is aware that I intended at this time to make a motion for downward departure under 5K2.0 in that there are some mitigating circumstances with respect to this case that were not, in my opinion, adequately considered in the guidelines.

The Court is well aware of the reason we have two separate proceedings, one in Montgomery County and one up here

in the Northern District, one in the Middle District and one in the Northern District, which in my opinion all of the cases should have been handled in the Middle District, and therefore, that could not have possibly been anticipated under the quidelines.

And under 5K2.2, I would ask this Court to downward depart one level which would give a resulting sentencing range with the minimum of one hundred months with a criminal history four.

At that time, I would ask the Court to sentence the defendant per the plea agreement to the minimum sentence of one hundred months concurrently with his sentence in the Middle District and then of course the gun case has to be consecutive.

Thank you.

MR. DEAN: The government has no objection to that motion.

THE COURT: The Court finds that the defendant's motion for downward departure pursuant to 5K2.0 based on the fact that there are mitigating circumstances that were not taken, could not be taken into consideration by the guidelines should be granted.

The Court finds that the appropriate guideline level should be level twenty-seven, which when combined with a criminal history category of four, creates a guideline range of

one hundred to one hundred twenty-five months, and a fine range from twelve thousand five hundred to one hundred twenty-five thousand dollars.

Mr. Forehand, is there anything that you would like to say before the Court pronounces sentence in this case?

THE DEFENDANT: I would just like to say that I never intended to hurt anybody and the gun wasn't loaded. And I just had a drug problem. And I know it's not no excuse. And I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Okay. Does the government have anything it would like to say at this time?

MR. DEAN: No, Your Honor. The government stands by its recommendation in the plea agreement.

THE COURT: Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, the judgment of the Court is that the defendant, Terry Lynn Forehand, is hereby committed to the custody of the bureau of prisons to be imprisoned for a term of one hundred months on counts one, three, four to be served concurrently and to a term of seven years on count five to be served consecutively to the terms of imprisonment imposed on counts one, three and four.

The Court is imposing a sentence at the low end of the guideline range as to counts one, three and four for the following reasons: It's the Court's opinion that had this matter been handled along with the case in Montgomery that a sentence in this range would have been appropriate in that

matter.

1 4l

The sentence imposed on counts one, three and four shall run concurrently with the sentence imposed in the case of the United States District Court of the Middle District of Alabama and the sentence in count five shall run consecutively to the sentence imposed in that case.

The Court is not ordering the defendant to pay a fine because the defendant does not have the ability to pay the minimum guideline fine and restitution.

The defendant is ordered to pay restitution in the amount of twenty-three thousand five hundred and ninety dollars with interest waived in the following amounts to the following banks: First Citizens Bank, eight thousand eighty-five dollars; to SouthTrust Bank, two thousand nine hundred and sixty dollars; to Regions Bank, twelve thousand five hundred forty-five dollars.

The Court has considered the information in the presentence report concerning the defendant's financial circumstances and the Court has relied on that information to determine that the following manner and schedule of payment is appropriate in this case.

During the period of incarceration, the defendant is to make payments of a minimum of twenty-five dollars per quarter in accordance with the bureau of prisons inmate financial responsibility program.

Upon release from imprisonment, any remaining balance shall be paid in equal monthly installments during the specified term of supervised release. The defendant is to make monthly payments during the period of supervision in accordance with the financial guidelines previously approved by the Court for use in this district and administered by the probation office.

It is further ordered that the defendant shall pay to the United States the mandatory special assessment of four hundred dollars. The fine and special assessment are due immediately and may be collected in accordance with the bureau of prisons inmate financial responsibility program.

Upon release from imprisonment, the defendant shall be placed on supervised release for a term of five years.

While on supervised release, the defendant shall comply with the standard conditions of supervised release of record in this court and the following special conditions:

One, the defendant shall not incur any new debts other than normal debts for utilities, rental expenses or mortgage payments or open any new lines of credit without permission of the probation officer, unless the defendant is in compliance with the payment of the monetary obligation ordered.

Two, the defendant shall participate if and as directed by the probation officer in the drug and alcohol intensive counseling and after care service program conducted

by the probation office or a comparable program conducted in the district of supervision.

Three, the defendant shall participate if and as directed by the probation officer in such mental health or vocational rehabilitation programs as the officer may direct.

The defendant shall contribute to the cost of mental health treatment if the probation officer determines that the defendant has the ability to do so.

Is there any objection from any party as to findings of fact, calculations, the sentence or the manner in which the sentence was pronounced or imposed?

MR. BOUDREAUX: None from the defendant, Your Honor.

MR. DEAN: No objection from the government.

THE COURT: Mr. Forehand, you have the right to appeal the sentence imposed within ten days if you believe that the guidelines have been misapplied or the sentence is otherwise in violation of law. However, you have entered into a plea agreement which waives some or all of your rights to appeal the sentence. Such waivers generally are enforceable. However, if you believe that the waiver is unenforceable, you can present that theory to the appellate court.

With a few exceptions, any notice of appeal must be filed within ten days of judgment being entered. If you are unable to pay the cost, you may apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis and for the appointment of counsel. If you are

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

241

25

allowed by the court to proceed on appeal in forma pauperis, upon your request the clerk of the court will assist you in preparing and filing of a notice of appeal. The Court has the following recommendations to the bureau of prisons. The Court recommends that the bureau of prisons consider placement of the defendant in any anger management counseling or other programs as available. The Court also strongly recommends the placement of the defendant in an intensive drug treatment program. And the Court also recommends that the bureau of prisons consider placement of the defendant in any sex offender counseling or other programs that may be available as well. The defendant is already in custody. Have you already begun serving the federal sentence on the Montgomery --MR. BOUDREAUX: He has been in federal custody for about a year now. THE DEFENDANT: January 25th 2002. THE COURT: Is there any other matter we need to take up? MR. BOUDREAUX: No, ma'am. THE COURT: Thank you. (Adjourned) CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct

1	transcript from the record of proceedings in the
2	above-referenced matter.
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	Mes - Rolina 4/13/04
8	Teresa Roberson, RPR, RMR
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	